UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,209	11/06/2006	John Rodney Keats	CU-4693 RJS	8022
	DAS & PARRY LLP 4 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE		EXAMINER	
224 SOUTH M			WILLIAMS, MONICA L	
SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/568,209	KEATS, JOHN RODNEY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MONICA L. WILLIAMS	3644	

	MONICA L. WILLIAMS	3644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>31 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviteal (with appeal fee) in compliance w	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the properties of the properties of the content of the properties of the prop</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	11 3	0 1 3 0	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>72-91</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael R Mansen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3644			
- 1			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant's argument that Stone does not disclose "a centrally located aperture adapted to have the elongated body pass through the bottom wall", this argument is not persuasive because with reference to Figure 1 Stone clearly discloses a centrally located aperture (28) which is adapted to have the elongated body pass through the bottom wall (24). In response to applicant's argument that one would not have reasonable expectation of success from combining Stone and Lund, this argument is not persuasive because in Stone the water is carried up the elongated body through wicking and in Lund the water is carried up through the elongated body through a pump. The Examiner maintains that either method of taking up water would be obvious over the other. Also the Applicant discloses in the specification in [0030] that the elongated body may be either a cord or a pipe.